

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected “Claims 1 – ” under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over “the admitted prior art” in view of Singh, United States Patent No. 6,425,547 (“Singh”). As to Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that the admitted prior art shows all the elements of the claimed invention except the use of an accumulator and a gluing device. As to the former, the Examiner asserts that Singh teaches that the use of a festoon accumulator is preferred for use in an unwinding and rewinding device. As to the latter, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to add the glue applicator to the apparatus of the admitted prior art in view of Singh because the gluing step can be inserted into the continuous process thereby producing a product more desirable to consumers.

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include the structure of the accumulator device contained in Claim 2. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Singh, which concerns a device that has a different structure, is overcome. Specifically, Singh comprises two festoon rollers positioned above one another that move toward or away from one another to discharge or accumulate a reserve portion of fabric. Col. 3, lines 26-28. In contrast, amended Claim 1 claims an accumulator with a series of lower fixed rollers below a series of vertically mobile rollers.

In addition, Singh belies the Examiner’s view that it would have been obvious to add a glue applicator to an apparatus that allows for a continuous process. That is, although Singh purports to provide a continuous system for producing products such as rolls of sanitary or tissue paper (Co. 1, lines 17-19), and includes a host of parts to improve the process (see, e.g., Figs. 2-5H), it makes no reference to a gluing step.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments to Claim 1 overcome the rejections.

Regarding Claim 2, the Examiner asserts that “festoons with a frame and a series of fixed rollers alternating with series of vertically mobile rollers are conventional in accumulators.” Although Applicant is unclear what Examiner is relying upon for his view concerning what is conventional, Applicant respectfully submits that the accumulator of Claim 2 as amended and incorporated into Claim 1 is not “conventional.” Again, Applicant notes that Singh itself does not support the view that festoons with a frame and a series of fixed rollers alternating with series of vertically mobile rollers are conventional in accumulators since Singh discloses two rollers, neither of which is fixed.

Regarding Claim 3, the Examiner asserts that the location of the embossing rollers and glue applicators would be determined by routine optimization. With respect to the latter, Applicant again notes that the use of glue applicators in the claimed apparatus is not obvious as evidenced by Singh, which makes no reference to a gluing step. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have occasion to experiment so as to reach optimization. In addition, since Claim 3 depends from Claim 1, which is patentable, Claim 3 is also patentable.


Regarding Claim 4, the Examiner asserts that the use of independent motors would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Although the Examiner did not advise Applicant whether this view was based on prior art or something else, the issue is moot in light of the amendments to Claim 1, from which Claim 4 depends.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, made certain prior art of record. Applicant notes such action.

It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment places the Claims in condition for allowance.

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James V. Costigan
Reg. No. 25,669

MAILING ADDRESS

Hedman & Costigan, P.C.
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
(212) 302-8989